

Atty. Dkt. No. 035451-0185 (3731.Palm)

REMARKS

Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the present application in view of the foregoing amendments and in view of the reasons that follow.

A detailed listing of all claims that are, or were, in the application, irrespective of whether the claims remain under examination in the application, is presented, with an appropriate defined status identifier.

After amending the claims as set forth above, Claims 1-15 and 17-29 are now pending in this application.

Rebuttal Of Response To Arguments

In the response to arguments, the Examiner indicated that arguments filed on 03/15/04 have been fully considered, but they are not persuasive. The Examiner indicated that just because Meyerson et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,579,487) describes a configurable electronic work slate unit as being selectively integrated in a compact and highly ergonomic structure, an example of which includes an RF communication model, that there is some analogy of a work slate unit to the handheld computing device of Applicants' claims. Further, the Examiner indicates that a scenario where size and shape is of no importance in two cited CCPA cases indicates that a work slate unit taught in Meyerson et al. is the same as a handheld computing device of Applicants' claims. To these two assertions, Applicants disagree.

As explained in Applicants' reply of 03/15/04, Applicants provided ample evidence of the definition of a "handheld computer" thereby differentiating it from a work slate computer. Further, Applicants respectfully submit that just because the work slate computer of Meyerson et al. includes a RF modulator for radio frequency communication, does not mean that it is anything like a handheld computer. RF modulators for radio frequency communication may be incorporated into devices of any size. Further, the Examiner indicates that what is described in Meyerson et al. is an electronic work slate unit in a compact and highly ergonomic structure. However, Applicants respectfully submit that compact and highly ergonomic structure in 1992,

Atty. Dkt. No. 035451-0185 (3731.Palm)

when the original Meyerson et al. application was filed, had different meaning to one of ordinary skill in the art than it did at the time of Applicants' filings in 2002. Further, just because Meyerson et al. describes a compact and highly ergonomic structure, it does not describe a handheld computing device. The work slate unit which is the only device taught by Meyerson et al. would have been seen as a compact and ergonomic structure, especially at the time in which the application was filed in 1992. Accordingly, there is no teaching or suggestion of a handheld computing device in Meyerson et al.

Further, the Examiner indicated that where size and shape is of no importance, there is no difference between a work slate unit and a handheld computer. However, Applicants refer the Examiner to the Specification in which the advent of the handheld computer makes it important for the Applicants' invention. For example, the Applicants refer the Examiner to page 1 of the application to page 3 of the application, paragraphs [0003] to [0008]. In these paragraphs, the Applicants provide meaningful reasons for needing the claimed invention, including, but not limited to the fact that handheld computing devices were at the time of the invention, in transition and therefore it would have been beneficial to provide an interchangeable display unit. Further, and possibly more importantly, because the needs of different users of the handheld computing unit may be vastly different due to its extremely small size and extreme portability, there may be a need to interchange displays for a single user or for different users. Therefore, there is a significant reason for Applicants to provide interchangeable display modules for a handheld computing device. As such, Applicants have claimed in Claims 1-15 and 17-29, a handheld computing device and therefore the teachings of Meyerson et al. are not applicable. Based on this alone, Applicants respectfully submit that Claims 1-15 and 17-29 are allowable.

Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. § 103

With regard to Claims 4, 5, and 23, Meyerson et al. does not disclose, teach, or suggest a flexible, expandable, or foldable display. The need for a flexible, expandable, or foldable display is a unique need for a handheld computing device. In fact, the teachings of Meyerson et al. of a work slate computer, provide no advantage for a expandable, flexible, or foldable display,

Atty. Dkt. No. 035451-0185 (3731.Palm)

because the work slate computer of Meyerson et al. is already a fairly large size and therefore an expandable or foldable display is not required and a flexible display also provides no advantages, because many expandable or foldable displays are also flexible. Meyerson et al., as the Examiner indicated, teaches a removable sheet display which is described as a planar display in an LCD display configuration. See, for example, column 6, lines 55-67. Nowhere in Meyerson et al. is there taught a flexible display, an expandable display, or a foldable display as is contemplated by Applicants and described in paragraph [0027] on page 7, paragraph [0034] on page 9, and paragraph [0037] on pages 9 and 10. Because Meyerson et al. does not disclose, teach, or suggest a flexible, expandable, or foldable display, Applicants respectfully submit that Claims 4, 5, and 23 are allowable.

Referring now to Claims 2, 20, and 21, Applicants respectfully submit that Meyerson et al. does not teach the use of wireless connections for the display device. See, e.g., pages 6-7, paragraph [0026]. Applicants contemplate that the display device may be used not only while attached to the handheld computing device, but also while being separated from the handheld computing device. What is taught in Meyerson et al. is that there may be a back assembly 170 which attaches to module docking assembly 172 that has a direct connection, flexible wire connection, optical, radio, capacitive, or other coupling arrangements. What is not contemplated by Meyerson et al. is that there is a wireless connection between the display unit 64A and the docking assembly. See, for example, column 10, lines 4-28. Applicants however, contemplate, as stated above that there may exist a wireless connection between the handheld computing device providing advantages which were not contemplated by Meyerson et al. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit the Claims 2, 20, and 21 are therefore allowable.

Applicants believe that the present application is now in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration of the application as amended is respectfully requested.

The Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned by telephone if it is felt that a telephone interview would advance the prosecution of the present application.

Atty. Dkt. No. 035451-0185 (3731.Palm)

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any additional fees which may be required regarding this application under 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.16-1.17, or credit any overpayment, to Deposit Account No. 06-1447. Should no proper payment be enclosed herewith, as by a check being in the wrong amount, unsigned, post-dated, otherwise improper or informal or even entirely missing, the Commissioner is authorized to charge the unpaid amount to Deposit Account No. 06-1447. If any extensions of time are needed for timely acceptance of papers submitted herewith, Applicants hereby petition for such extension under 37 C.F.R. §1.136 and authorizes payment of any such extensions fees to Deposit Account No. 06-1447.

Respectfully submitted,

Date September 01, 2004

By Alistair K. Chan

FOLEY & LARDNER LLP
Customer Number: 26371
Telephone: (414) 297-5730
Facsimile: (414) 297-4900

Alistair K. Chan
Attorney for Applicants
Registration No. 44,603